

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 21. This sheet, which includes Fig. 21, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 21.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 41-47 are pending in this case, Claims 1- 40 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, Claims 46 and 47 having been added, and Claims 41-45 having currently been amended. Support for amended Claims 41-45 can be found, for example, in the original claims, drawings, and specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to due to informalities; Claims 1, 40, 42, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; Claims 1 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Tiao et al. (U.S. Patent 6,318,863; hereinafter “Tiao”); and Claims 40-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Li (U.S. Patent 6,587,269).

In response to the objection to the drawings, Applicants have amended Figure 21 to include the legend “Background Art,” in accordance with the suggestion set forth in the outstanding Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the drawings has been overcome.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1, 40, 42, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicants have canceled Claims 1 and 40, rendering the rejection of these claims moot. In regard to Claims 42 and 44, Applicants have amended these claims to correct the informalities noted in the outstanding Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 40, 42, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Claims 1 and 20 have been canceled, rendering the rejections moot. However, new independent Claims 46 and 47 recite features formerly of Claims 1 and 20, and other novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by Tiao and Li. New Claims 46 and 47 find non-limiting support in the disclosure as originally filed, for example at page 38, line 13 to page 40, line 14.

Therefore, the changes to the claims are not believed to raise a question of new matter.<sup>1</sup>

Independent Claim 46 is directed to an illumination arrangement including, *inter alia*:

a solid state light source;

a light collecting, integrating and re-directing device configured to receive at least a part of emitted light from said solid state light source and to redirect said received light; and

a light coupling mechanism configured to improve coupling efficiency of said emitted light from said solid state light source to said light collecting, integrating and redirecting device.

Page 4 of the outstanding Office Action states that Tiao describes “a light collecting, integrating and redirecting device (210, 220) being adapted for receiving at least a part of said primary illumination light from said light source device (col. 3, ln. 14-18) and for redirecting said received primary illumination light so as to obtain the redirected primary illumination light and for outputting said redirected primary illumination light or a derivative thereof as secondary illumination light.” However, Tiao fails to teach or suggest “a light coupling mechanism configured to improve coupling efficiency of said emitted light from said solid state light source to said light collecting, integrating and redirecting device,” as recited in Applicants’ independent Claim 46.

In Tiao, there is a light source 200 and a taper light pipe 210, 220, but there is no ***additional*** light coupling mechanism which improves the coupling efficiency between the

---

<sup>1</sup> See MPEP 2163.06 stating that “information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter.”

light source 200 and the taper light pipe 200. In contrast, in Applicants' independent Claim 46, there is a solid state light source, a light collecting, integrating and redirecting device, and a light coupling mechanism placed in between the light source and redirecting device which is configured to improve coupling efficiency of the emitted light from the solid state light source to the light collecting, integrating and re-directing device.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 46 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguishes over Tiao.

Applicants respectfully submit that new Claim 46 also patentably distinguishes over Li. Li does not describe a solid state light source or a light coupling mechanism used to improve the coupling efficiency between the solid state light source and the light collecting, integrating and re-directing device. Li only describes how to avoid a loss of light power in a polarization recovery system for projection displays. The device of Li converts the polarization of otherwise lost light and afterwards redirects the light. However, in Li, there is no teaching or suggestion of how to improve the coupling efficiency from an unpolarized solid state light source to a light collecting, integrating and re-directing device.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 46 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguishes over Li.

New Claim 47 recites an illumination arrangement including "a light coupling means for improving coupling efficiency of said emitted light from said solid state light source to said light collecting, integrating and redirecting device," and is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

As none of the cited references, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest all the elements of independent Claims 46 and 47, Applicants submit the inventions defined by

Claims 46 and 47, and all claims depending therefrom, are not rendered obvious by the asserted references for at least the reasons stated above.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, the pending claims as presented herewith are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)  
DPB/rac

I:\ATTY\DPB\28's\282780US\282780US-AM.doc

  
Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Derek P. Benke  
Registration No. 56,944

<sup>2</sup> MPEP § 2142 "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest **all** the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)."